

From: SEEDS Joshua <SEEDS.Joshua@deq.state.or.us>
Sent time: 01/02/2014 05:10:13 PM
To: Powers, David
Cc: Kubo, Teresa; Peterson, Erik; Henning, Alan; Leinenbach, Peter; MICHIE Ryan <Michie.Ryan@deq.state.or.us>; SEEDS Joshua <SEEDS.Joshua@deq.state.or.us>
Subject: RE: Extra Materials for December 17, 2013 CMER Meeting

Dave,

Thanks for sending those on. One of our big hurdles is the lack of protection on small Type-N (non-fish-bearing; headwaters) streams which generally make up 40-60% of the stream network, length-wise. This lack of protection includes landslide-prone areas as well. It appears that CMER is moving forward on a robust Type-N monitoring program as well as gathering additional information about the adequacy of Washington's rules for protecting landslide-prone areas.

Washington State seems to have much more stable and larger budget than Oregon's forest practices monitoring program. I think EPA involvement in Washington can be beneficial to Oregon in a couple of ways. The research done in Washington is applicable to Oregon, generally speaking, so if EPA is taking an active role in supporting those efforts and getting solid results, we can prevent duplication of effort in Oregon. Also, there are several areas, including those mentioned above, in which it would be good for Oregon Dept of Forestry to conduct a systematic review of the evidence on particular questions, such as the impact of harvest-unit related landslides on water quality and related beneficial uses. Given the resources available to ODF's private forests monitoring unit, we won't be able to answer some questions just through new work done by that unit. With Washington's rules being more stringent and protective than Oregon's as it is, evidence of water quality impacts in Washington is strong evidence of impacts in Oregon.

Thanks,
Josh

Joshua Seeds

Nonpoint Source Pollution Analyst
Drinking Water Protection Program
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
811 SW 6th Ave.
Portland, OR 97204
Phone: 503-229-5081 Fax: 503-229-6037
Email: seeds.joshua@deq.state.or.us

From: Powers, David [mailto:Powers.David@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 31, 2013 3:35 PM
To: SEEDS Joshua
Cc: Kubo, Teresa; Peterson, Erik; Henning, Alan; Leinenbach, Peter
Subject: FW: Extra Materials for December 17, 2013 CMER Meeting

Josh – attached are edited versions of the 2015 CMER workplan – one edited by the broader science advisory group and the other edited by the riparian science advisory group. As you know CMER (cooperative monitoring evaluation and research) is the committee set up to oversee the monitoring and science efforts undertaken to demonstrate that the Forests and Fish Rules are protecting water quality and T&E species covered under an ESA HCP/incidental take permit and to prompt adaptive management/rule changes when necessary. CMER includes timber industry, environmental group, tribal, and State Agency participants. Federal agencies can participate but usually do so sparingly. As you know WA's forestry rules provide substantially more protection for WQ than OR's forestry rules with respect to riparian and high risk landslide prone areas. WA's rules also require a comprehensive forest roads program similar to the one you laid out initially for the mid-coast IR TMDL. Even with this higher level of protection CMER is undertaking substantial monitoring and research given uncertainty related to WQ and species protection under the F&F Rules. I wouldn't recommend reading the entire workplan but the summary gives a good overview and I've excerpted the index of monitoring/research efforts, some of which could be useful in evaluating Oregon forest practices down the road.

I've also included Teresa, Erik, Peter and Alan because they: 1) are substantially smarter than I am; 2) are good EPA forestry contacts for you; and 3) may also find the CMER related research relevant to their own forestry related work. One of the things I've been contemplating is increased EPA involvement in WA private forestry. The past decade or so EPA has primarily participated on the Forest and Fish policy group that approves CMER budgets and workplans and that resolves disputes between the 5 primary F&F stakeholder groups (same as CMER plus federal agencies). The logic in the past has been there is

more opportunity for improvement in ID and OR. But there may be an opportunity to export some of the WA research in a way that supports improvements outside of WA. I won't make any New Year's resolutions about increased EPA involvement in WA but would be interested on your and the above EPA quartet's thoughts. Dave

FY15 CMER Projects Project	Status	Page
Westside Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity, & Function (BCIF)	Field implementation (Extended monitoring)	35
Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies	Analysis & report writing	36
Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies – Amphibian Demographics/Channel Metrics	Field implementation (Extended monitoring)	36
Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies – Temperature, Sediment, Vegetation, Litter Fall	Field implementation (Extended monitoring)	36
Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Soft Rock Lithologies	Field implementation	37
Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology	Analysis & report writing	46
Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness	Scoping	46
Buffer Integrity - Shade Effectiveness (Amphibians)	In ISPR review	53
Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Temperature, Type Np	Analysis & report writing To be initiated in the field	64
Westside Eastside Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Vegetation, Type Np Westside and Eastside (Baseline)	To be initiated	64
Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment (EWRAP)	Analysis & report writing	84
Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Effectiveness	To be initiated	94
Bull Trout Overlay Temperature (Eastside Riparian Shade/Temperature)	In ISPR review	99
Eastside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring (BTO add-on)	Field implementation	100
Riparian Hardwood Conversion	Analysis & report writing	105
Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring – Temperature, Type F, Westside	Analysis & report writing	110
Unstable Slopes Criteria Evaluation and Development	To be initiated	130
Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring	To be initiated	143
Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Program	To be initiated	165
Forest Practices and Wetlands Systematic Literature Review	Analysis & report writing	167
Wetlands Program Research/Monitoring Strategy Development	In WetSAG discussion	167
RMZ Re-Sample (birds)	Analysis & report writing	181

From: cmer-bounces@mailman1.u.washington.edu [<mailto:cmer-bounces@mailman1.u.washington.edu>] **On Behalf Of** SHRAMEK, PATTI (DNR)

Sent: Friday, December 13, 2013 2:58 PM

To: cmer@u.washington.edu

Subject: [cmer] Extra Materials for December 17, 2013 CMER Meeting

Greetings,

Please find attached the SAGE and RSAG edits for the 2015 CMER Workplan. These will be discussed during the science session.

Also, please remember to bring treats!

Thanks,

Patti Shramek

Contract Specialist

Forest Practices Division

Washington Department of Natural Resources

(DNR)

360-902-1388

patti.shramek@dnr.wa.gov

www.dnr.wa.gov